



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

argueatis is the reading of A. *argentis* BTCV. Perhaps Donatus wrote *arcentis*, as *arceo* and *arguo* are often confused in MSS. Eun. 315. Wessner reads *quam accuraverit fames*. Some may prefer the emendation of Goetz, *macerauerit*, or Sabbadini's *attenuaverit*, but as Terence in the next line uses *curatura*, I think Wessner is justified in keeping *accuraverit*.

On p. 14 the emendation *appotis* credited to Leo, belongs also to Bentley. Andria 473 we find a note not given by Klotz IVNO LUCINA *Iunonis filia*. *Graece* Εἰλεῖθνα. *Latini Nixos dicunt*. This must be added to the few references given by the Dictionaries for *Nixi*. Cf. Festus pp. 174 and 177 and Roscher's Dictionary. The new edition also furnishes some new words And. 788, *subpalpatio*, Eun. 236, *morologia*, Eun. 240, *obiurganter*, Eun. 537 *amusus*. We have also a new instance of *oricula* = *auricula* in Eun. 539. Whether *intersumptam* is to be accepted, And. 286, on the evidence of TC. may be doubted, for A has *interfunctam* (= *interpunctam*?) V, *interruptam* which through the vulgar form *interrumptam* may have given rise to *intersumptam*.

The quotations from other authors embedded in Donatus especially from Sallust and Lucilius are often improved in form, and in the case of passages still doubtful, we have at any rate now a reliable apparatus from which to proceed to further conjectures. All in all we congratulate Wessner on the way in which he has accomplished his difficult task, and we await with impatience the concluding volume which will contain not only the commentary of Donatus and the other plays, but also the commentary of Eugraphius and the Scholia Bembina.

MINTON WARREN.

Sénèque le Rhéteur Controverses et Suasoirs, Traduction Nouvelle, Texte Revu par H. BORNECQUE, 2 tomes, Garnier Frères, Paris.

The assiduous labors of Leonard Spengel in the field of Greek Rhetoric, begun just seventy-five years ago, promised to give a lasting impulse to this long neglected branch of philological research, but his influence practically died with him, and the great bulk of his own work now possesses little more than a historical interest and value. This apathetic attitude of classical scholars was doubtless the direct outcome of that indifference to beauty of form and stylistic elaboration for its own sake which generally distinguishes the latter half of the last century. Rhetoric was all but synonymous with bombast and affectation, and it cannot be denied that something of this connotation in *malam partem* still clings to the term, but the last two decades have witnessed a remarkable revival of rhetorical studies in all directions, and the movement thus inaugurated bids fair to continue unabated.

While the despotic sway which Rhetoric exercised over literary expression in antiquity was too conspicuous to be lost sight of,

its profound influence was perhaps more felt than demonstrated. The area, so to speak, in which it moved, the stylistic manifestations which it produced, the means, as it were, which it employed to realize its objects and the effect which it had upon the development and character of literature in general, all these problems had not been exhaustively studied or methodically analyzed. This is happily true no longer and, in consequence, we to-day possess a far deeper insight into the forces and elements which to so large an extent made classic literature what it is. With many of the secrets of its irresistible fascination already disclosed, a juster and fuller appreciation and a more unclouded, critical perspective than had hitherto been possible has been acquired.

This great advance was brought about in the first place by the appearance of scientific and up-to-date editions of works like Cicero's *Orator* and *de Oratore*, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Quintilian and the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Dionysius *περὶ ὕψους* and the *de elocutione*. Minute investigations into the nature and scope of prose rhythm and the utilization of its laws for textual criticism, no less than the attention bestowed upon rhetorical features in the exegesis of classical authors generally, also reveal the progress and intensity of modern rhetorical research. On the other hand the comprehensive and exhaustive works of Volckmann, Gerber, Blass, Peter, Norden, to mention only these, give a vivid idea of the manner in which our horizon has been extended within less than a generation.

Among the works rescued from the disastrous tidal wave that has swept away so many of the masterpieces on Ancient Rhetoric, the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* of the elder Seneca have always occupied a unique position as a priceless source of information for the history, development and influence of Roman Rhetoric, and yet no commentary has appeared for more than two centuries, although readable texts have repeatedly been published.

It was, therefore, natural to look forward with a keen expectancy to the work under notice, written, as it was, by a scholar favorably known by his accurate and acute researches into the *numerus* in Cicero, Pliny and Tacitus, and the fact that this new edition of Seneca Rhetor had been crowned by the French Academy augured well for the book.

A careful examination of its contents has, however, rudely shattered these expectations. A satisfactory exegetical edition of Seneca Rhetor still remains as great a desideratum as ever.

While this criticism is made deliberately, it may yet involve an injustice, in that M. Bornecque may possibly maintain that it was not his intention to supply an exhaustive commentary. In his preface, at least, he disclaims originality for his notes and no reference to them is made in the title page. Moreover, the collection of French translations of Latin classics to which this work belongs doubtless precluded a scientific and elaborate treat-

ment of the subject. But even on this plea, it were difficult to say, what class of readers the editor can have had in mind. It may fairly be questioned that there exist, even in France, many men of general culture who, though incapable of reading the Latin original, will be fired with an irresistible desire to peruse a work like that of Seneca Rhetor. But even if such there be, the Latin text printed below the translation, in so small a type as almost to preclude its perusal, seems a gratuitous addition, and yet it alone has chapter and paragraph numerals and all the lemmata of the notes refer to it.

The introduction is doubtless designed solely for this hypothetical lay reader, for it is elementary, superficial and commonplace, with the possible exception of a long passage virtually paraphrased from the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, although all reference to this fact is wanting, while a citation from G. Boissier to whom the book is dedicated, is duly credited.

The translation itself, though somewhat free, is, if a foreigner can presume upon an opinion, an admirable piece of work. The text upon which it is based, deviates from that of Müller in some 600 places¹ and, so far as I have compared the variant readings, Bornecque has shown a sound critical method and good judgment.

It is in the very brief commentary that M. Bornecque seems to have been quite unmindful of the question, '*Quis leget haec?*' His notes can be of no possible use to the reader for whom the Introduction and Translation are evidently designed, for there are pages filled with citations which will presumably be unintelligible to one in need of the translation, not to mention a great number of bald references to authors not readily accessible, even supposing that they were known to him. If, on the other hand, these notes are intended only for scholars, as, indeed, stray citations from a German dissertation, an allusion to Otto, *Sprichwörter*, to an article by Morawski, to the Roman *Prosopographia*, to Mommsen's *Strafrecht* and others seem to suggest, they are wholly inadequate. Thus not the slightest attempt is made to analyze the style of Seneca with a view to determining whether the diction as revealed in the prefaces is any way differentiated from the language which the rhetoricians are made to use, for only in this way can we discover to what extent the author's marvellous memory has succeeded in reproducing the original discussions. There is scarcely a trace touching upon the problems connected with the sources of the rhetorical themes themselves, and this is the more inexcusable, as Bornecque might have found considerable material on the subject in Simonds' *The Treatment of the Themes in Seneca Rhetor.*² The commentary,

¹ B. has given a list of these deviations and, in several instances, a special justification of his readings in the *Rev. de philol.* XXVI, pp. 360-378; XXVII, pp. 53-63.

² It is possible that the editor touched upon these matters, in his '*Les declamateurs et les declamations après Sénèque le père*', a book not accessible to me.

in fact, virtually consists of a mass of more or less relevant parallels in thought, culled chiefly from Cicero, Valerius Maximus, Seneca, and Quintilian. The entire collection is useful in that these passages are now made easily available, there being also not a few which we owe, so far as I can see, to the editor's own reading.

In matters of detail, Bornecque's comment is often open to criticism. Thus 'Sénèque le poète' and 'Sénèque le philosophe' are constantly distinguished from 'Sénèque le rhéteur' and he shrewdly suggests that these cognomina were devised to differentiate the *three* authors. That is, of course, true, only these epithets were given in *modern* times! Ancient authors² and our MSS know of no such distinction between the poet and philosopher, nor am I aware that any scholar of repute now denies their identity. In contrast with this unwarranted scepticism Bornecque still ascribes to Quintilian the *Declamationes* which have indeed passed under his name, but his authorship is now well recognized as an impossibility.

Quite a startling discovery is revealed by the citation, (e. g. Vol. I, p. 298) *l'auteur* des *Gesta Romanorum* and *l'auteur* du *Violier des Histoires Romaines* (e. g. Vol. I, p. 303), but their names are unfortunately still withheld.

Lucretia and Virginia, we are told, are often quoted by the rhetoricians as stock examples of virtue, the former is, however, mentioned more frequently as being of an earlier date!

In Contr. II 1, 26 the phrase '*amorem describere volo*' occurs, on which the editor remarks (p. 317), that it is probably an imitation of Anacreon's, θέλω, θέλω μανῆναι—θέλω, θέλω φιλῆσαι—θέλω λέγειν 'Ατρείδας, but these Anacreontics were not composed till centuries after Seneca's time!

But there is no use in multiplying illustrations of this exegetical nature, and I conclude by repeating that an adequate edition of Seneca is still to be written. In this work only the translation and the care bestowed upon the text can be conscientiously praised.

I believe Bornecque to be capable of better things, and it is devoutly to be wished that he will yet utilize his wide knowledge of Seneca Rhetor by giving us an exhaustive edition of the author that will satisfy modern scientific demands. It is not a Herculean task and, in any case, one that is "des Schweisses der Edlen werth."

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, N. Y.

A. GUDEMAN.

¹ Bornecque prefers 'le père' on the ground that Seneca never taught rhetoric!

² With the one exception of Sidonius Apollinaris who is notoriously untrustworthy in such matters.